

STAGENET 2006 EQUIPMENT PROCUREMENT

RFP NUMBER: 112-0503

SELECTION REPORT

Presented to the ITD Executive Steering Committee

September 23, 2005

Prepared by:

Federal Engineering, Inc.
10600 Arrowhead Dr.
Fairfax, VA 22030
703 359-8200



TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter 1	Introduction and Background
	A. RFP Background and STAGENet 2006
	B. Evaluation Committee Members
	C. Schedule of Events
Chapter 2	Evaluation Process and Criteria
Chapter 3	Overview of Proposals
Chapter 4	Scoring of Proposals
	A. Information Technology Solutions
	B. Product Support and Customer Service
	C. Experience, Qualifications, and Financial Strength
	D. Contractor Cost
Chapter 5	Detailed Cost Breakdown by Proposal
Chapter 6	Summary and Recommendations

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

A. RFP Background and STAGENet 2006

This Request for Proposal (RFP) is issued by the Information Technology Department (ITD) in coordination with the Office of Management and Budget of the State of North Dakota (hereinafter referred to as the State). The State currently supports a statewide Wide Area Network (WAN) called STAGENet (Statewide Technology Access for Government and Education Network). The purpose of this RFP is to elicit proposals for Customer Premises Equipment (CPE), including network, & video equipment, Cisco SMARTNet, and optical backbone equipment. The State is increasingly dependent on STAGENet to conduct internal business and to meet educational requirements. The State is seeking significant discounts off manufacturer list price for hardware, software, and related services. Because of the diversity of equipment being requested and the service/support options specified in this RFP, the State intends to issue multiple contracts. This RFP includes purchasing for State government and education.

B. Evaluation Committee Members

1. State Participants:

David Belgarde
Wayne Wermager
John Alvarez
Jim Swenson
Kim White

2. Federal Engineering Participants:

James Anderson
Mary Goosens

C. Schedule of Events

The RFP proceeded under the following schedule:

- RFP Issued: **8 July 2005**
- Letters of Interest are due **15 July 2005**
- Deadline for receipt of questions and objections related to the RFP: **20 July 2005**
- Deadline for the answers to questions and objections related to the RFP: **25 July 2005**
- Proposal Opening: **19 August 2005**
- Proposal Evaluation Committee evaluation completed: **1 September 2005**
- State issues Notice of Intent to Award a Contract: **2 September 2005**
- Contract signed: **21 October 2005**
- Contract start date: **01 January 2006**

CHAPTER 2

EVALUATION PROCESS AND CRITERIA

The evaluation process involved the committee completing the requirements checklist for each Offeror and then answering the questions contained in Appendix A from the proposals presented. A scale from None to Excellent was then applied as a grade and a consensus was reached by the committee as to what the point award within the grade would be applied (an Excellent rating in section 5.01 could range from 13 to 15 points).

This process was repeated for each Offeror for sections 5.01 through 5.03. The point awards were then calculated for each Offeror. Estimated dollars of spending were assigned per each Class (I-IV) of equipment and the discounts off of list price were used to calculate a dollar amount. The dollar amounts were then entered into the formula for calculating the points to be awarded for cost. The data from the above processes was entered into the summary chart and the point totals were calculated.

The committee then started with the company that scored the highest and noted the products being offered by that company. The committee continued doing this with the 2nd and 3rd highest companies as well. It was noted that good coverage of all the Classes (I-IV) and the products within those classes could be achieved by the top three scoring companies. These companies were then recommended as the companies to receive awards.

CHAPTER 3

OVERVIEW OF PROPOSALS

The following discussions provide a brief overview of each of the proposals with a discussion of general strengths and weaknesses as determined by the Evaluation Committee.

Corporate Technologies

Overview: This company offered a wide range of product offerings and had the highest overall score.

Strengths: This company did offer a wide range of products in Class I, II, and III of the RFP. They were rated excellent in product support and customer service.

Weaknesses: This company did not offer any video equipment or support for video. The cost of products for this vendor was a little bit higher than the company that was rated 2nd overall.

Qwest

Overview: This Company scored 2nd overall and they provided the widest range of products and they offered the best discount structure.

Strengths: They provided the widest range of products and the best discount structure.

Weaknesses: They did not score well in the experience, qualifications, and financial strength portion of the evaluation due to the limited information provided and some litigation issues.

AVI

Overview: This company scored 3rd overall however they only offered Class IV (video) equipment.

Strengths: Within Class IV they were the only vendor to respond to all of the requests.

Weaknesses: The company had a limited product offering due to bidding just on Class IV. The cost of some of the products offered was higher than competitors.

Enventis Telecom

Overview: This company scored 4th overall however they only offered Class I (Cisco) equipment and Class II (SmartNet).

Equipment Procurement RFP Selection Report

Strengths: They offered a competitive price and some value added features for SmartNet.

Weaknesses: The offering that they proposed was very limited and they did not score well in the Information Technology Solution area.

Network Center

Overview: This company scored 5th overall and they offered all Class I equipment and Class II (SmartNet).

Strengths: They did score slightly higher than the 4th highest overall score in the Information Technology Solution area.

Weaknesses: With the exception of the Information Technology Solution area they scored lower in all areas than the 1st four overall participants.

Wire One

Overview: This company scored 6th overall and they offered only Class IV (Tandburg) equipment and Class IV on site service.

Strengths: Product support and customer service was their strongest area.

Weaknesses: Everything but the product support and customer support area.

Graybar

Overview: This company scored 7th overall and they made an offer for some equipment within all the Classes however it was very limited within the Class.

Strengths: Offered some product for each Class.

Weaknesses: The proposal represented the 3rd highest cost and it did not rate favorably in the Information Technology, Product Support and Customer Service, or the Experience Qualifications and Financial Strength sections.

High Point Networks

Overview: This company scored 8th overall and they offered Class I (Nortel and (Cisco – wireless only)) and Class III equipment only.

Strengths: None.

Weaknesses: This company had a very limited product offering and it was the highest cost provider within Class III.

CDW

Overview: This company scored 9th overall and they did not bid on any of the equipment specified by the RFP.

Strengths: None.

Weaknesses: The proposal that this company presented did not follow the intent of the RFP. They offered equipment which was not requested within the RFP and failed to offer any of the equipment or services that was requested.

CHAPTER 4

SCORING OF PROPOSALS

The Evaluation Committee met during the week of August 22nd and jointly reviewed the proposals, discussed member's reactions to the proposals, and came to consensus on the points to be allocated to each proposal, in each scoring category. Each sub-category was reviewed for each proposal and was assigned one of the following qualitative factors based upon the consensus of the committee:

- None. Not addressed or response of no value
- Fair. Limited applicability
- Good. Some applicability
- Very Good. Substantial applicability
- Excellent. Total applicability

Based upon these assignments, the committee then chose the score that they felt best represented the completeness and applicability of the proposal for each scoring category, as described in the Evaluation Criteria section of the RFP.

Information Technology Solution – 15 Points Possible

Question	Corporate Technologies	Qwest	AVI	Eventis	Network Center	WireOne	Graybar	High Point	CDW
(a) Functionality	Excellent	Excellent	Very Good	Good	Good	Fair	Fair	Fair	None
(b) Software Maintenance Options	Good	Good	None	Good	Good	None	Fair	None	None
(c) Professional Support Services	Good	Very Good	Very Good	None	Fair	Fair	None	Good	None
(d) Value Added Functionality	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Good	None	Fair	None	None	None
(e) Optional On-site Services	Good	Good	Good	None	Fair	None	None	Fair	None
Overall	Very Good	Very Good	Good	Fair	Good	Fair	Fair	Fair	None
Total Info Tech Solution	10	12	6	4	5	1	2	3	0

Equipment Procurement RFP Selection Report

Comments: (record specific justification for scores received for each proposal)

Corporate Technologies:

[a] How well does the proposed product and/or service meets the functional requirements?

- They met the requirements very well.

How wide is the applicable range of equipment offered?

- Wide range for Class I, II, and III. A conference call was placed to verify that they could provide the Nortel Optera product line for the Class III proposal.

[b] Evaluation of software maintenance options available to the State?

- They met all the criteria.

[c] Evaluate the Offeror's response to professional support services.

- Response was vague in this area.

Has the offer proposed services that align with the requirements and demonstrate a good understanding of the scope required for this project?

- Somewhat.

[d] Has the Offeror offered any value-added functionality, products, services, or upgrades as part of the proposal that demonstrate added value?

- Proactive with seminars and informational meetings and presentations.

[e] How much value does the optional on-site services proposed offer the State?

- The offer did not indicate in the proposal significant added value.

Qwest:

[a] How well does the proposed product and/or service meets the functional requirements?

- Within the product lines that they bid on they did a very through job.

How wide is the applicable range of equipment offered?

- They provide the widest range of product offerings.

[b] Evaluation of software maintenance options available to the State?

Equipment Procurement RFP Selection Report

- Adequate for all the product lines that the company bid on.

[c] Evaluate the Offeror's response to professional support services.

- Adequate.

Has the offer proposed services that align with the requirements and demonstrate a good understanding of the scope required for this project?

- Yes they provided extensive information that indicated they understood the scope of the project well.

[d] Has the Offeror offered any value-added functionality, products, services, or upgrades as part of the proposal that demonstrate added value?

- The proposal indicates that for video they will provide free on site maintenance during the warranty.

[e] How much value does the optional on-site services proposed offer the State?

- Good value.

AVI:

[a] How well does the proposed product and/or service meets the functional requirements?

- Well for Class IV.

How wide is the applicable range of equipment offered?

- Excellent for Class IV.

[b] Evaluation of software maintenance options available to the State?

- Not offered.

[c] Evaluate the Offeror's response to professional support services.

- Good offering of professional services in Class IV.

Has the offer proposed services that align with the requirements and demonstrate a good understanding of the scope required for this project?

- Excellent in Class IV.

Equipment Procurement RFP Selection Report

[d] Has the Offeror offered any value-added functionality, products, services, or upgrades as part of the proposal that demonstrate added value?

- Yes, the product demonstrations and design services represent significant value.

[e] How much value does the optional on-site services proposed offer the State?

- Adequate.

Enventis:

[a] How well does the proposed product and/or service meets the functional requirements?

- Limited range of product offering within Cisco Class I. Good breadth of response for Class II except they only offer annual billing.

How wide is the applicable range of equipment offered?

- Offering all Cisco hardware only.

[b] Evaluation of software maintenance options available to the State?

- Covered under SmartNet.

[c] Evaluate the Offeror's response to professional support services.

Has the offer proposed services that align with the requirements and demonstrate a good understanding of the scope required for this project?

- No on site services offered.

[d] Has the Offeror offered any value-added functionality, products, services, or upgrades as part of the proposal that demonstrate added value?

- With SmartNet they are offering an additional program.

[e] How much value does the optional on-site services proposed offer the State?

- None.

Network Center:

[a] How well does the proposed product and/or service meets the functional requirements?

- Limited product offering. No stocking strategy.

Equipment Procurement RFP Selection Report

How wide is the applicable range of equipment offered?

- No Class III or IV.

[b] Evaluation of software maintenance options available to the State?

- They did not indicate that the State would have direct access to Cisco for SmartNet.

[c] Evaluate the Offeror's response to professional support services.

- The proposal was vague and did not include pricing.

Has the offer proposed services that align with the requirements and demonstrate a good understanding of the scope required for this project?

- No, they failed to show the proper understanding of what the State desires.

[d] Has the Offeror offered any value-added functionality, products, services, or upgrades as part of the proposal that demonstrate added value?

- The value added services listed are not consistent with this RFP.

[e] How much value does the optional on-site services proposed offer the State?

- No additional value because it was poorly defined.

WireOne:

[a] How well does the proposed product and/or service meets the functional requirements?

- Not very well. No same day service offering.

How wide is the applicable range of equipment offered?

- One Class IV vendor offering.

[b] Evaluation of software maintenance options available to the State?

- Not offered.

[c] Evaluate the Offeror's response to professional support services.

- Very limited.

Has the offer proposed services that align with the requirements and demonstrate a good understanding of the scope required for this project?

Equipment Procurement RFP Selection Report

- Does not meet the scope of the project.

[d] Has the Offeror offered any value-added functionality, products, services, or upgrades as part of the proposal that demonstrate added value?

- The proposal has minimal added value to the State.

[e] How much value does the optional on-site services proposed offer the State?

- Best effort response does not meet the State's needs.

Graybar:

[a] How well does the proposed product and/or service meets the functional requirements?

- To a limited extent.

How wide is the applicable range of equipment offered?

- Cisco product offerings were not complete; however they did offer alternative products.

[b] Evaluation of software maintenance options available to the State?

- Very limited.

[c] Evaluate the Offeror's response to professional support services.

- Did not bid for on site support.

Has the offer proposed services that align with the requirements and demonstrate a good understanding of the scope required for this project?

- The services did not align with the State's needs.

[d] Has the Offeror offered any value-added functionality, products, services, or upgrades as part of the proposal that demonstrate added value?

- No.

[e] How much value does the optional on-site services proposed offer the State?

- No bid.

High Point:

Equipment Procurement RFP Selection Report

[a] How well does the proposed product and/or service meets the functional requirements?

- Good for Class III.

How wide is the applicable range of equipment offered?

- They responded with Nortel equipment in Class I and III.

[b] Evaluation of software maintenance options available to the State?

- None offered.

[c] Evaluate the Offeror's response to professional support services.

- Adequate.

Has the offer proposed services that align with the requirements and demonstrate a good understanding of the scope required for this project?

- Yes, on what they responded to.

[d] Has the Offeror offered any value-added functionality, products, services, or upgrades as part of the proposal that demonstrate added value?

- No.

[e] How much value does the optional on-site services proposed offer the State?

- Some value to the State.

CDW:

[a] How well does the proposed product and/or service meets the functional requirements?

- Not at all.

How wide is the applicable range of equipment offered?

- The product offered was not a product in use by the State.

[b] Evaluation of software maintenance options available to the State?

- No.

[c] Evaluate the Offeror's response to professional support services.

Equipment Procurement RFP Selection Report

- Did not respond to professional support services.

Has the offer proposed services that align with the requirements and demonstrate a good understanding of the scope required for this project?

- No.

[d] Has the Offeror offered any value-added functionality, products, services, or upgrades as part of the proposal that demonstrate added value?

- No value.

[e] How much value does the optional on-site services proposed offer the State?

- None.

Product Support and Customer Service – 30 Points Possible

Question	Corporate Technologies	Qwest	AVI	Enventis	Network Center	WireOne	Graybar	High Point	CDW
(a) Order Processes	Excellent	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Fair
(b) Technical Support Services	Very Good	Excellent	Excellent	Good	Fair	Very Good	Fair	Fair	Fair
(c) Customer Inquiry Plan	Excellent	Good	Good	Very Good	Very Good	Good	Fair	Good	Fair
(d) Account Representation	Excellent	Excellent	Excellent	Good	Very Good	Good	Fair	Good	Fair
(e) Billing/Reporting Options	Excellent	None	None	Good	None	None	Good	None	None
(f) Timely Delivery of Spares	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Fair	Fair	Fair	None	Fair	None
Overall	Excellent	Very Good	Very Good	Good	Good	Good	Fair	Fair	Fair
Total Product Support and Customer Service	23	18	19	11	9	10	3	4	3

Comments: (record specific justification for scores received for each proposal)

Corporate Technologies:

Equipment Procurement RFP Selection Report

[a] How much effort is required by the State to process orders for equipment or services?

- Well documented and it requires little effort by the State.

[b] Evaluation of the technical support services included with the contract and other technical support options?

- They did not address the 1-4 hour response. They did address same day and next day.

[c] How well has the Offeror identified its plan for handling customer inquiries and response time to inquiries?

- They responded with a clear timeframe that was reasonable.

[d] Evaluation of the proposed sales support/account representation and customer relationship services and strategies offered?

- Very detailed response that was well defined and tailored to the individual customer.

[e] Has the Offeror proposed any billing or reporting options that provide value to the State?

- They will have a portal that the customer can use for service and order tracking.

[f] Has the Offeror met the requirements for the timely delivery of material and spares depot?

- They met the requirements via manufacturer's warranties and mentioned State providing some spares.

Qwest:

[a] How much effort is required by the State to process orders for equipment or services?

- No process was defined by Qwest. They just made a general statement that they would follow the State's procedure.

[b] Evaluation of the technical support services included with the contract and other technical support options?

- They have provided a complete listing of manufacturer technical support and internal support for products. A wide selection of service options. Qwest did a good job in identifying manufacturer warranties.

[c] How well has the Offeror identified its plan for handling customer inquiries and response time to inquiries?

- Generic response that did not provide specific timelines.

Equipment Procurement RFP Selection Report

[d] Evaluation of the proposed sales support/account representation and customer relationship services and strategies offered?

- They provided an extensive response on the account representation for the goals outlined for the team.

[e] Has the Offeror proposed any billing or reporting options that provide value to the State?

- None stated.

[f] Has the Offeror met the requirements for the timely delivery of material and spares depot?

- They met the minimum requirements but did not provide any additional value in their offering.

AVI:

[a] How much effort is required by the State to process orders for equipment or services?

- Easy to order, but the process is only partially described.

[b] Evaluation of the technical support services included with the contract and other technical support options?

- Four scheduled maintenance agreements, ability dispatch tech throughout most of the state within 4 hours.

[c] How well has the Offeror identified its plan for handling customer inquiries and response time to inquiries?

- Adequate

[d] Evaluation of the proposed sales support/account representation and customer relationship services and strategies offered?

- Very well in Class IV.

[e] Has the Offeror proposed any billing or reporting options that provide value to the State?

- No significant value to the State.

[f] Has the Offeror met the requirements for the timely delivery of material and spares depot?

- Yes, including the offer to store spares. They also are able to provide emergency spares from their present inventory.

Equipment Procurement RFP Selection Report

Enventis:

[a] How much effort is required by the State to process orders for equipment or services?

- Easy to process orders and a very detailed process outlined.

[b] Evaluation of the technical support services included with the contract and other technical support options?

- The program listed relies on SmartNet and company appears to be totally dependent on Cisco for technical support.

[c] How well has the Offeror identified its plan for handling customer inquiries and response time to inquiries?

- They described it well.

[d] Evaluation of the proposed sales support/account representation and customer relationship services and strategies offered?

- Good.

[e] Has the Offeror proposed any billing or reporting options that provide value to the State?

- The reports add minimal value to the State.

[f] Has the Offeror met the requirements for the timely delivery of material and spares depot?

- The proposal is SmartNet dependant.

Network Center:

[a] How much effort is required by the State to process orders for equipment or services?

- Low effort level.

[b] Evaluation of the technical support services included with the contract and other technical support options?

- Marginal, because they do not provide anything beyond the manufacturer's warranty.

[c] How well has the Offeror identified its plan for handling customer inquiries and response time to inquiries?

- Defined the responses well.

Equipment Procurement RFP Selection Report

[d] Evaluation of the proposed sales support/account representation and customer relationship services and strategies offered?

- Support of the account is clear.

[e] Has the Offeror proposed any billing or reporting options that provide value to the State?

- No.

[f] Has the Offeror met the requirements for the timely delivery of material and spares depot?

- Will follow the manufacturer's warranty and require the State to purchase spares.

WireOne:

[a] How much effort is required by the State to process orders for equipment or services?

- Requires little effort.

[b] Evaluation of the technical support services included with the contract and other technical support options?

- They provided a detailed description of the technical support.

[c] How well has the Offeror identified its plan for handling customer inquiries and response time to inquiries?

- They have a clearly detailed plan.

[d] Evaluation of the proposed sales support/account representation and customer relationship services and strategies offered?

- Documented well. It appears adequate.

[e] Has the Offeror proposed any billing or reporting options that provide value to the State?

- Offering did not represent value to the State.

[f] Has the Offeror met the requirements for the timely delivery of material and spares depot?

- The proposed delivery interval is questionable due to the location of the spares depot.

Graybar:

[a] How much effort is required by the State to process orders for equipment or services?

Equipment Procurement RFP Selection Report

- Little effort is required.

[b] Evaluation of the technical support services included with the contract and other technical support options?

- Poor due to the 100 mile limit.

[c] How well has the Offeror identified its plan for handling customer inquiries and response time to inquiries?

- They identified their plan well however the plan is not acceptable to the State.

[d] Evaluation of the proposed sales support/account representation and customer relationship services and strategies offered?

- Not adequately explained.

[e] Has the Offeror proposed any billing or reporting options that provide value to the State? The customized report has some value to the State.

[f] Has the Offeror met the requirements for the timely delivery of material and spares depot?

- No, they only provide timely service up to 100 miles from Fargo.

High Point:

[a] How much effort is required by the State to process orders for equipment or services?

- Very little.

[b] Evaluation of the technical support services included with the contract and other technical support options?

- Relies on the manufacturer's warranty.

[c] How well has the Offeror identified its plan for handling customer inquiries and response time to inquiries?

- Adequate.

[d] Evaluation of the proposed sales support/account representation and customer relationship services and strategies offered?

- Adequate for what was proposed.

[e] Has the Offeror proposed any billing or reporting options that provide value to the State?

Equipment Procurement RFP Selection Report

- No.

[f] Has the Offeror met the requirements for the timely delivery of material and spares depot?

- Yes.

CDW:

[a] How much effort is required by the State to process orders for equipment or services?

- Adequate.

[b] Evaluation of the technical support services included with the contract and other technical support options?

- Adequate.

[c] How well has the Offeror identified its plan for handling customer inquiries and response time to inquiries?

- Adequate.

[d] Evaluation of the proposed sales support/account representation and customer relationship services and strategies offered?

- Poor.

[e] Has the Offeror proposed any billing or reporting options that provide value to the State?

- No.

[f] Has the Offeror met the requirements for the timely delivery of material and spares depot?

- No.

Experience, Qualifications, and Financial Strength – 15 Points Possible

Question	Corporate Technologies	Qwest	AVI	Enventis	Network Center	WireOne	Graybar	High Point	CDW
(a) Experience on Similar Projects	Very Good	Good	Very Good	Very Good	Fair	Good	None	Fair	None
(b) Complete Resumes with Background	Very Good	Very Good	Good	Very Good	Good	Good	None	None	None
(c) Applicable Education and Experience	Excellent	Good	Good	Good	Good	Good	None	None	None
(d) Timeliness and Successful Past Delivery	Excellent	Good	None	None	Very Good	None	None	None	None
(e) Satisfactory References	Good	Fair	Very Good	Good	Good	Good	None	Good	None
(f) Letters of Reference	None	None	None	None	Good	None	None	None	None
(g) Subcontractor Evaluation	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	None	None	N/A	Good	N/A
(h) Financial Stability	Good	Fair	Very Good	Very Good	Good	Fair	Fair	Fair	Good
(i) Manufacturer Relationships	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Excellent	Very Good	Very Good	Fair	Fair	Fair
Overall	Very Good	Good	Very Good	Very Good	Good	Good	Fair	Fair	None
Total Experience, Qualifications, and Financial Strength	12	7	11	11	8	8	1	3	0

Comments: (record specific justification for scores received for each proposal)

Corporate Technologies:

[a] Do the individuals assigned to the project have experience on similar projects?

- Yes

Equipment Procurement RFP Selection Report

[b] Are resumes complete and do they demonstrate backgrounds that would be desirable for individuals engaged in the work the RFP requires?

- Yes.

[c] How extensive is the applicable education and experience of the personnel designated to support the State?

- Extensive.

[d] How successful is the general history of the firm regarding timely and successful delivery of the requested services and support?

- Very good.

[e] If references were required, did the references provide information to verify the satisfactory performance of the vendor?

- Just references not testimonials.

[g] Has the Offeror provided letters of reference from previous clients?

- No

[h] If a subcontractor will perform work on the project, how well does it measure up to the evaluation used for the Offeror?

- No subcontractors will be used.

[i] If company financial statements were required, does the firm appear to be financially stable?

- Yes

[j] What is the strength of the relationship between the Offeror and the manufacturers they represent based on the information provided from the Offeror?

- Good relationships with manufactures.

Qwest:

[a] Do the individuals assigned to the project have experience on similar projects?

- Adequate.

Equipment Procurement RFP Selection Report

[b] Are resumes complete and do they demonstrate backgrounds that would be desirable for individuals engaged in the work the RFP requires?

- Yes.

[c] How extensive is the applicable education and experience of the personnel designated to support the State?

- Adequate.

[d] How successful is the general history of the firm regarding timely and successful delivery of the requested services and support?

- The information provided was not adequate to make a determination.

[e] If references were required, did the references provide information to verify the satisfactory performance of the vendor?

- Information not provided within the proposal.

[g] Has the Offeror provided letters of reference from previous clients?

- No

[h] If a subcontractor will perform work on the project, how well does it measure up to the evaluation used for the Offeror?

- No subcontractors.

[i] If company financial statements were required, does the firm appear to be financially stable?

- Was not provided within the proposal.

[j] What is the strength of the relationship between the Offeror and the manufacturers they represent, based on the information provided from the Offeror?

- Very good.

AVI:

[a] Do the individuals assigned to the project have experience on similar projects?

- Yes, for Class IV.

[b] Are resumes complete and do they demonstrate backgrounds that would be desirable for individuals engaged in the work the RFP requires?

Equipment Procurement RFP Selection Report

- Adequate.

[c] How extensive is the applicable education and experience of the personnel designated to support the State?

- Adequate.

[d] How successful is the general history of the firm regarding timely and successful delivery of the requested services and support?

- No testimonials were provided.

[e] If references were required, did the references provide information to verify the satisfactory performance of the vendor?

- References were provided.

[g] Has the Offeror provided letters of reference from previous clients?

- No.

[h] If a subcontractor will perform work on the project, how well does it measure up to the evaluation used for the Offeror?

- No subcontractors.

[i] If company financial statements were required, does the firm appear to be financially stable?

- Appears sound.

[j] What is the strength of the relationship between the Offeror and the manufacturers they represent based on the information provided from the Offeror?

- Very strong.

Enventis:

[a] Do the individuals assigned to the project have experience on similar projects?

- Yes.

[b] Are resumes complete and do they demonstrate backgrounds that would be desirable for individuals engaged in the work the RFP requires?

- Yes.

Equipment Procurement RFP Selection Report

[c] How extensive is the applicable education and experience of the personnel designated to support the State?

- Adequate.

[d] How successful is the general history of the firm regarding timely and successful delivery of the requested services and support?

- Not stated.

[e] If references were required, did the references provide information to verify the satisfactory performance of the vendor?

- Yes.

[g] Has the Offeror provided letters of reference from previous clients?

- No.

[h] If a subcontractor will perform work on the project, how well does it measure up to the evaluation used for the Offeror?

- Will not use subcontractors.

[i] If company financial statements were required, does the firm appear to be financially stable?

- Yes.

[j] What is the strength of the relationship between the Offeror and the manufacturers they represent based on the information provided from the Offeror?

- Very strong.

Network Center:

[a] Do the individuals assigned to the project have experience on similar projects?

- The experience listed did not totally align with the State's needs.

[b] Are resumes complete and do they demonstrate backgrounds that would be desirable for individuals engaged in the work the RFP requires?

- Yes

Equipment Procurement RFP Selection Report

[c] How extensive is the applicable education and experience of the personnel designated to support the State?

- Adequate.

[d] How successful is the general history of the firm regarding timely and successful delivery of the requested services and support?

- Based on the testimonials the company provides good service but it was not in the scope the State's needs.

[e] If references were required, did the references provide information to verify the satisfactory performance of the vendor?

- Yes.

[g] Has the Offeror provided letters of reference from previous clients?

- Yes.

[h] If a subcontractor will perform work on the project, how well does it measure up to the evaluation used for the Offeror?

- No response from the Offeror.

[i] If company financial statements were required, does the firm appear to be financially stable?

- Yes.

[j] What is the strength of the relationship between the Offeror and the manufacturers they represent based on the information provided from the Offeror?

- Strong.

WireOne:

[a] Do the individuals assigned to the project have experience on similar projects?

- Adequate for what they proposed.

[b] Are resumes complete and do they demonstrate backgrounds that would be desirable for individuals engaged in the work the RFP requires?

- Adequate for what they proposed.

Equipment Procurement RFP Selection Report

[c] How extensive is the applicable education and experience of the personnel designated to support the State?

- Adequate for what they proposed.

[d] How successful is the general history of the firm regarding timely and successful delivery of the requested services and support?

- No testimonials provided.

[e] If references were required, did the references provide information to verify the satisfactory performance of the vendor?

- References were provided.

[g] Has the Offeror provided letters of reference from previous clients?

- No.

[h] If a subcontractor will perform work on the project, how well does it measure up to the evaluation used for the Offeror?

- The response was not clear about subcontractors and left a way that they might be used.

[i] If company financial statements were required, does the firm appear to be financially stable?

- There were some comments in the D&B report that caused some concern.

[j] What is the strength of the relationship between the Offeror and the manufacturers they represent based on the information provided from the Offeror?

- Very good.

Graybar:

[a] Do the individuals assigned to the project have experience on similar projects?

- Not adequately explained, information not provided.

[b] Are resumes complete and do they demonstrate backgrounds that would be desirable for individuals engaged in the work the RFP requires?

- Not adequately explained, information not provided.

[c] How extensive is the applicable education and experience of the personnel designated to support the State?

Equipment Procurement RFP Selection Report

- Not adequately explained, information not provided.

[d] How successful is the general history of the firm regarding timely and successful delivery of the requested services and support?

- No testimonials provided to verify history.

[e] If references were required, did the references provide information to verify the satisfactory performance of the vendor?

- No references provided.

[g] Has the Offeror provided letters of reference from previous clients?

- No.

[h] If a subcontractor will perform work on the project, how well does it measure up to the evaluation used for the Offeror?

- They did not list the use of subcontractors.

[i] If company financial statements were required, does the firm appear to be financially stable?

- Difficult to determine with the information provided.

[j] What is the strength of the relationship between the Offeror and the manufacturers they represent based on the information provided from the Offeror?

- Poor, not affiliated with Cisco.

High Point:

[a] Do the individuals assigned to the project have experience on similar projects?

- Unclear.

[b] Are resumes complete and do they demonstrate backgrounds that would be desirable for individuals engaged in the work the RFP requires?

- No.

[c] How extensive is the applicable education and experience of the personnel designated to support the State?

- Not adequately provided.

Equipment Procurement RFP Selection Report

[d] How successful is the general history of the firm regarding timely and successful delivery of the requested services and support?

- Not sufficiently documented.

[e] If references were required, did the references provide information to verify the satisfactory performance of the vendor?

- References were provided.

[g] Has the Offeror provided letters of reference from previous clients?

- No.

[h] If a subcontractor will perform work on the project, how well does it measure up to the evaluation used for the Offeror?

- Nortel was listed as a potential subcontractor and is adequate.

[i] If company financial statements were required, does the firm appear to be financially stable?

- They have been in business for less than three years so it difficult to determine.

[j] What is the strength of the relationship between the Offeror and the manufacturers they represent based on the information provided from the Offeror?

- Appears to be in the process of establishing the relationships.

CDW:

[a] Do the individuals assigned to the project have experience on similar projects?

- Experience level not provided in the proposal.

[b] Are resumes complete and do they demonstrate backgrounds that would be desirable for individuals engaged in the work the RFP requires?

- No.

[c] How extensive is the applicable education and experience of the personnel designated to support the State?

- Not provided.

Equipment Procurement RFP Selection Report

[d] How successful is the general history of the firm regarding timely and successful delivery of the requested services and support?

- No testimonials provided.

[e] If references were required, did the references provide information to verify the satisfactory performance of the vendor?

- References were not provided.

[g] Has the Offeror provided letters of reference from previous clients?

- No.

[h] If a subcontractor will perform work on the project, how well does it measure up to the evaluation used for the Offeror?

- They did not indicate the use of subcontractors.

[i] If company financial statements were required, does the firm appear to be financially stable?

- Yes.

[j] What is the strength of the relationship between the Offeror and the manufacturers they represent based on the information provided from the Offeror?

- Strong for the one manufacturer that was offered.

Equipment Procurement RFP Selection Report

Cost of Proposal – 40 Points Possible

Question	Corporate Technologies	Qwest	AVI	Enventis	Network Center	WireOne	Graybar	High Point	CDW
(a) Points based upon cost	36	40	39	39	36	32	33	26	0

Comments: (record specific justification for scores received for each proposal)

The formula stated in the RFP was used to determine the amount of points awarded which was:

Price of Lowest Cost Proposal

Price of Proposal Being Rated X Total Points for Cost Available = Awarded Points

The total estimated annual dollars used for the combined equipment purchases was \$1,000,000. That amount was divided out in roughly same proportions as are currently being experienced with \$350,000 to Class I, \$150,000 to Class II, \$200,000 to Class III (new), and \$500,000 to Class IV.

The calculations were done in two groupings, Class I to Class III and then Class IV. The cost calculation is the amount of dollars applied to the Class times (100 minus the discount provided).

Class of Equipment	Qwest	Enventis Telecom	Corporate Technologies	Network Center	Graybar	High Point Networks
Class I	206,500	213,500	213,500	227,500	245,000	N/A
Points for Class I	40	39	39	36	34	N/A
Class II	112,500	114,000	116,250	129,000	139,500	N/A
Points for Class II	40	39	39	35	32	N/A
Class III	101,000	N/A	129,000	N/A	N/A	158,000
Points for Class III	40	N/A	31	N/A	N/A	26
Average Points Per Company	40	39	36	36	33	26

Class IV Equipment	Qwest	AVI	Graybar	WireOne
PolyCom	340,000	341,000	425,000	N/A
Tandburg	N/A	365,000	N/A	420,000
Average Price	340,000	353,000	425,000	420,000

Equipment Procurement RFP Selection Report

Points for Class IV	40	39	32	32
------------------------	----	----	----	----

Equipment Procurement RFP Selection Report

Total Points Awarded – 100 Points Possible

Category	AVI	Enventis	WireOne	High Point Networks	Corporate Technologies	CDW	NetWork Center	Graybar	Qwest
Information Technology Solution (15)	Good (6)	Fair (4)	Fair (1)	Fair (3)	Very Good (10)	None (0)	Good (5)	Fair (2)	Very Good (12)
Product Support and Customer Service (30)	Very Good (19)	Good (11)	Good (10)	Fair (4)	Excellent (23)	Fair (3)	Good (9)	Fair (3)	Very Good (18)
Experience, Qualifications, and Financial Strength (15)	Very Good (11)	Very Good (11)	Good (8)	Fair (3)	Very Good (12)	None (0)	Good (8)	Fair (1)	Good (7)
Contract Cost (40)	(39)	(39)	(32)	(26)	(36)	(0)	(36)	(33)	(40)
Total Points Awarded (100)	(75)	(65)	(51)	(36)	(81)	(3)	(58)	(39)	(77)

CHAPTER 5**DETAILED COST BREAKDOWN BY PROPOSAL****DISCOUNT OFF LIST PRICE COMPARISON**

The percentages listed below are the discounts off of list price that the Offerors provided in their proposals.

Class I IP Network Infrastructure (LAN/WAN Hardware)

	Current	Corporate Technologies	Network Center, Inc	Graybar	Qwest	Enventis Telecom	High Point Networks
Cisco	39%	39%	35%	Up to 5XXX 30%	41%	39%	No Bid
Nortel		32%*	2%	No Bid	GBICs 44% Switches 44%	No Bid	GBICs 40% Switches 39% ARN Router 40% Wireless LAN 31%
APC		30%*	10% - 18%	26%	No Bid	No Bid	No Bid
Linksys		25%*	22%	No Bid	No Bid	No Bid	No Bid
Onsite Support		Networking \$125/hr Advanced Networking \$150/hr	ICB	No Bid		No Bid	No Bid

* 10% Maintenance

Class II SMARTNet

	Current	Corporate Technologies	Network Center, Inc	Graybar	Qwest	Enventis Telecom
Government		15%	14%	7%	20%	10% Existing 17% New & Renewals
Education		30%	No Comment	No Comment	30%	10% Existing 31% New & Renewals

Class III Optical Transport (Backbone)

	Current	Corporate Technologies	Qwest	High Point Networks
Optical Transport Equipment		Cisco 39% Nortel 32%	Cisco 41% Nortel Optera 3000 Series 58%	OM 3XXX/5XXX 21% OM3XXX Options 36%
Optical Transport Software & Replacement Maintenance		Cisco 39%		
Other Transport Equipment				
Maintenance		Nortel 10%		10%

Class IV Video Equipment (Codec Units and Hardware)

	AVI	Qwest	Graybar	WireOne
Polycom	32%	32%	15%	
Tandberg	27%			16%

All of the discounts listed for Class IV equipment represent the average discount for equipment in that Class from the Offeror. Qwest had a significant discount of 51% on one item that could result in significant savings to education.

CHAPTER 6

SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The committee found that by selecting the three highest scoring companies that all of the equipment requested was covered by at least one company. For much of the equipment the State has two companies to choose from. The three companies that are recommended for award are Corporate Technologies, Qwest, and AVI.

Qwest provided the best cost to the State, Corporate Technologies and AVI provided the best product support and customer service to the State. In general the discount structure from list price remained very close to the previous contract. One notable exception was a higher discount offered by Qwest for Class IV (Video) equipment.

Appendix A

Section Five of the RFP contained the following evaluation criteria and contractor selection information, which explained how the proposals would be scored. The total number of points used to score this contract is **100**, broken down in the following manner:

Information Technology Solution	15 points
Product Support and Customer Service	30 points
Experience, Qualifications, and Financial Strength	15 points
Contract Cost	40 points
Total Points Possible	100 points

5.01

Information Technology Solution

Fifteen Percent (15%) of the total possible evaluation points will be assigned to this criterion.

Weight *15 Percent*. Maximum Point Value for this Section
100 Points x *15 Percent = 15 Points*

Rating Scale (<i>15 POINT</i> Maximum)	
Point Value	Explanation
<i>0</i>	None. Not addressed or response of no value
<i>1-4</i>	Fair. Limited applicability
<i>5-8</i>	Good. Some applicability
<i>9-12</i>	Very Good. Substantial applicability
<i>13-15</i>	Excellent. Total applicability

Proposals will be evaluated against the questions set out below.

[a] How well does the proposed product and/or service meets the functional requirements? How wide is the applicable range of equipment offered?

[b] Evaluation of software maintenance options available to the State?

[c] Evaluate the Offeror's response to professional support services. Has the offer proposed services that align with the requirements and demonstrate a good understanding of the scope required for this project?

[d] Has the Offeror offered any value-added functionality, products, services, or upgrades as part of the proposal that demonstrate added value?

[e] How much value does the optional on-site services proposed offer the State?

5.02

Product Support and Customer Service

Thirty Percent (30%) of the total possible evaluation points will be assigned to this criterion.

Weight **30 Percent**. Maximum Point Value for this Section

100 Points x **30 Percent = 30 Points**

Rating Scale (30 POINT Maximum)	
Point Value	Explanation
0	None. Not addressed or response of no value
1-7	Fair. Limited applicability
8-14	Good. Some applicability
15-22	Very Good. Substantial applicability
23-30	Excellent. Total applicability

Proposals will be evaluated against the questions set out below.

[a] How much effort is required by the State to process orders for equipment or services?

[b] Evaluation of the technical support services included with the contract and other technical support options?

[c] How well has the Offeror identified its plan for handling customer inquiries and response time to inquiries?

[d] Evaluation of the proposed sales support/account representation and customer relationship services and strategies offered?

[e] Has the Offeror proposed any billing or reporting options that provide value to the State?

[f] Has the Offeror met the requirements for the timely delivery of material and spares depot?

5.03

Experience, Qualifications, and Financial Strength

Fifteen Percent (15%) of the total possible points will be assigned to this criterion.

Weight *15 Percent*. Maximum Point Value for this Section

100 Points x *15 Percent = 15 Points*

Rating Scale (<i>15 POINT</i> Maximum)	
Point Value	Explanation
<i>0</i>	None. Not addressed or response of no value
<i>1-4</i>	Fair. Limited applicability
<i>5-8</i>	Good. Some applicability
<i>9-12</i>	Very Good. Substantial applicability
<i>13-15</i>	Excellent. Total applicability

Proposals will be evaluated against the questions set out below.

[a] Do the individuals assigned to the project have experience on similar projects?

[b] Are resumes complete and do they demonstrate backgrounds that would be desirable for individuals engaged in the work the RFP requires?

[c] How extensive is the applicable education and experience of the personnel designated to support the State?

[d] How successful is the general history of the firm regarding timely and successful delivery of the requested services and support?

[e] If references were required, did the references provide information to verify the satisfactory performance of the vendor?

[g] Has the Offeror provided letters of reference from previous clients?

[h] If a subcontractor will perform work on the project, how well does it measure up to the evaluation used for the Offeror?

[i] If company financial statements were required, does the firm appear to be financially stable?

[j] What is the strength of the relationship between the Offeror and the manufacturers they represent based on the information provided from the Offeror?

5.04

Contract Cost

Forty Percent (40%) of the total possible evaluation points will be assigned to cost.

Converting Cost to Points

The State will convert discounts to cost by applying discounts against future purchasing estimates.

After applying any reciprocal preference, the lowest cost proposal will receive the maximum number of points allocated to cost. The point allocations for cost on the other proposals will be determined as follows:

Price of Lowest Cost Proposal

Price of Proposal Being Rated X Total Points for Cost Available = Awarded Points

Any prompt payment discounts terms proposed by the Offeror will not be considered in evaluating cost. The cost amount used for evaluation may be affected by the application of North Dakota preference laws (N.D.C.C. § 44-08-01). The lowest cost proposal will receive the maximum number of points allocated to cost. The point allocations for cost on the other proposals will be evaluated according to the method set forth in the Proposal Evaluation form attached to this RFP.